REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Specification

The Applicants have amended Page 1 of the specification to replace patent application numbers with granted serial numbers where applicable, and have also corrected various typographical errors. The Applicants submit that these amendments introduce no new matter.

Claim Dependency

With reference to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, we have now amended claim 7 to cancel the multiple dependencies. We note that we had intended to make this amendment during our previous response but the actual amendment to claim 7 was omitted due to a clerical error and we would like to apologise to the Examiner for this omission.

In view of the amendment made to claim 7, we believe that claim 8 is no longer objected to under section 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has maintained objections on the basis of Wolff et al. Whilst we do not believe that these objections are valid, we have further amended the claims to refer specifically to the formatted information including visible information, the spatial extent of which corresponds to the user interactive element. The claim also now states that the coded data is coincident with the visible information so that when the sensing device is placed in an operative position relative to the visible information, the coded data is sensed. A basis for this can be found for example on page 10, lines 3 to 13 which discusses how the spatial extent of the graphic 8 corresponds to the zone 7 defining the submit button 6.

As far as the Examiner's objections are concerned, we respectively submit that the barcode of Wolff et al is not a user interactive element. In particular, interaction with the document occurs by making entries in either the columns 22, 22'. Thus, when a user is to make an entry the user will scan the barcode merely to allow the document to be identified. However scanning the barcode alone does not cause interaction. Rather interaction will not occur until the user enters a suitable mark in an appropriate rectangle in columns 22, 22' as clearly set out on page 9 of the specification. In view of this, we simply cannot accept the Examiner's submission that the barcode represents a user interactive element. Instead, the barcode merely represents an identifier allowing the document to be identified.

Despite this however, and in view of the Examiner's clarification in paragraph 8 that the visual information is not recited in the rejected claims, the Applicant is adding in reference to the visual information as described above. It will be appreciated by the Examiner that Wolff clearly does not teach providing both visible information and coded data. In particular, whilst the coded data in Wolff is visible, there is not the provision of both visible information and separate but coincident coded data. Thus the barcode could be deemed to be either visible information or coded data, but not both.

In view of this we respectfully submit that claim 1 is novel and inventive of the cited prior art. Furthermore as these distinction were expressed in our previous response, we do not believe that this raises new issues for consideration.

Turning now to dependent claim 12, the Examiner has maintained objections to this on the basis of Wolff et al and explicitly commented that Wolff does teach sensing movement relative to the document using the coded data. The Examiner has referred to page 11, lines 16 to 21 which state that the system establishes the location of a written entry using gyroscopic rate information. The specification indicates that the location of the barcode is known and then velocity information is integrated. This does not correspond to sensing movement using coded data as is asserted by the Examiner.

This disclosure in Wolff is very explicit in that the system allows a position to be determined using the coded data. Movement from this position is not sensed using coded data but rather is sensed using gyroscopic rate information. In contrast to this, claim 12 is clearly directed towards sensing movement relative to the documents using the coded data. This is complete contrast to Wolff which senses a position using coded data and then senses movement from a position using gyroscopic rate information.

In contrast to this, the present invention senses coded data provided over the document and can actually determine its movement from the sensing of coded data. This is explicitly claimed in claim 12 which refers to sensing its movement relative to the document using the coded data whereas Wolff explicitly states on page 11, line 16 that the barcode is used to establish the location of the written entry by sensing the location of the barcode, and then sensing movement using gyroscopic rate information.

In view of this, we respectfully submit that the claims are in order for allowance.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 19, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:

KIA SILVERBROOK

PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +6-12-9818-6633
Facsimile: +61-2-9555-7762